

## REMARKS

In the Office Action dated April 18, 2005, claim 16 was objected to because the Examiner stated it is unclear where the body of the claim begins. In addition to other amendments to claim 16, discussed in more detail below, claim 16 has been amended to use the transition term "comprising" and to reorganize the claim elements in an identifiable listing thereof. The informalities in claim 16 are therefore submitted to be overcome.

Claims 1, 4, 7-17 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hounsfield et al.

In response, independent claims 1, 16 and 17 have been amended to make clear that the gantry is mounted at a bearing that allows tilting of the gantry relative to a stationary part of the computed tomography apparatus. For the reasons discussed below, claims 1, 16 and 17 are submitted to be in condition for allowance, and therefore claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 18 and 21, which the Examiner has stated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, had been retained in dependent form at this time.

In substantiating the rejection of claims 1, 16 and 17 based on Hounsfield et al., the Examiner acknowledged that a bearing is not explicitly shown in the Hounsfield et al. reference, but the Examiner cited language at column 1, lines 54-56 of the Hounsfield et al. reference as describing the inherent presence of a bearing that allows rotation of the ring member 2 around a patient so that the patient can be irradiated with x-rays from the x-ray tube 1 at different angular positions.

As is explicitly stated at column 1, lines 62-65, the rotation of the ring member 2 occurs around an axis 5 that is disposed perpendicularly to the fan-shaped x-ray

beam 4. In other words, the rotation of the ring member 2 in the Hounsfield et al. reference takes place in the plane of the drawing.

By contrast, the movement of the gantry relative to the stationary part of the computed tomography apparatus in each of independent claims 1, 16 and 17 was intended to be a tilting movement, allowing the gantry to be positioned at non-perpendicular angles relative to the floor or base on which the stationary part stands. In other words, the movement of the gantry relative to the stationary part is to allow the principal plane of gantry to be able to assume a non-zero angle with respect to the principal plane of the stationary part.

Each of independent claims 1, 16 and 17 has been amended to make clear that this is the type of movement that is intended, by stating that the gantry is mounted in the stationary part by a bearing that allows tilting of the gantry relative to the stationary part. No such bearing, and thus no such tilting capability, is present in the Hounsfield et al. reference. Since the Hounsfield et al. reference does not disclose or suggest a bearing of the type set forth in independent claims 1, 16 and 17, the Hounsfield et al. reference does not disclose or suggest introducing a flow of cooling gas at a region of such a bearing, between the stationary part and the gantry, as set forth in original claims 1, 16 and 17.

Providing effective cooling for computed tomography systems of the type wherein the gantry can be tilted relative to a stationary part of the apparatus presents particular problems, which are not present in a device of the type exemplified by the Hounsfield et al. reference, wherein no such tilting capability is provided.

The Hounsfield et al. reference therefore does not disclose all of the elements of claims 1, 4, 7-17 or 19-21, and thus does not anticipate any of those claims.

All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Submitted by,

*Steven H. Noll* (Reg. 28,982)

**SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP  
CUSTOMER NO. 26574**

Patent Department  
6600 Sears Tower  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312/258-5790  
Attorneys for Applicant.

CH1\4296889.1